

When I think of the worry on the floor of this House over the sovereignty issue when we get into trade matters, will the World Trade Organization impose its views on our laws, and the answer to that is no, we do not allow that, we do not allow international agreements to impose themselves in a way that contradicts our domestic law, yet that is exactly what this provision in this bill would do in terms of following U.S. money with a requirement for citizens in other countries to literally abrogate their law.

Let me tell Members why we really have to strike this provision. If a woman comes in and she is already pregnant and she wants a termination, and I am the health person, do Members really want me to say, "I cannot say that word, so you will have to leave and go someplace else to talk to other people?" No. We want to be able to say to that woman, look, maybe she does not have to have an abortion. Maybe she could carry this pregnancy because we can help her after that not to get pregnant again.

Because that is what we are trying to do: We are trying to teach family planning services. We are trying to give women the power to control their reproductive capabilities responsibly.

If she then says, "No, I absolutely have to for a lot of reasons: I have 10 children, we cannot afford it," whatever it is, "and if I cannot get it here, I will go to the back alley," do Members not think it is better for us to say, well, she can legally get a safe, clean abortion, and then come back and we will help her? Through the power of knowledge in a free society, we will help her prevent this and she will never again get in this position where she faces an unwanted pregnancy.

Contraceptives are the right answer to abortion. I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to strike.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 seconds to respond briefly.

The plain text and the implementation by the Clinton administration and by the Reagan-Bush administrations proves that the Mexico City Policy has nothing whatsoever to do with counseling for abortions. That is not on the table, it is not being considered. As much as I would rather it be the case, it is not part of this amendment.

Secondly, the Mexico City Policy does provide for abortions for rape, incest, or life of the mother with their own funds.

Finally, the Policy reflects our intent that every effort to treat a woman suffering from an incomplete abortion be done and is fully authorized by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

□ 1045

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote no on the proposed amendment, the Greenwood motion to strike.

The compromise language already in the bill is the result of long negotiations between this Congress and the President last year. At that time those of us in the House who believe in the sanctity of life felt strongly that no taxpayer money should be used to fund groups that perform or promote abortion or lobby for abortion laws overseas.

The President, needless to say, does not agree with our position; and so we did what we are supposed to do in the legislative process, we compromised. We did not get everything we wanted, and neither did the President.

Mr. Chairman, these negotiations took a long time and a lot of effort to produce the best possible result for all concerned. More to the point, the President signed it. To remove the compromise language would undo all of that hard work. Why reopen a controversy that has already been settled?

I would like to remind my colleagues that under the Reagan-Bush administration, international family planning funds were abortion free, and they got their yearly grants as long as they were abortion free. Most family planning organizations agreed to those conditions. Only two disagreed, one which is responsible for 200,000 abortions a year in the United States refused funds in order to continue their proabortion activities.

The second day after President Clinton was first inaugurated, he issued executive orders. One of the first executive orders he issued was the Mexico City reversal of the pro-life policies, and so the organizations through most of the Clinton administration have received their yearly subsidy with the ability to promote and perform.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that removing this language is really a radical departure of the well being of the American people. The effect of this amendment would be to allow virtually unlimited funding to the international abortion industry and the abortion lobbyists. It would remove the cap of \$385 million, which is the grant money they receive every year, and even the President says that abortions should be rare. A vote for this amendment is a vote to spend.

They could potentially spend up to \$1.3 billion to promote abortion worldwide to lobby other governments against the abortion laws. This is not something the House should be voting for. More than half the nations of the world have laws restricting abortions.

Why should we use taxpayer money from the United States to fund international family planning and lobbyists? Who are we to be sending lobbyists into foreign lands to change policies of other governments that even the American people would not want? Being a superpower does not give us that sort of authority.

The Mexico City policy also recognizes that money is fungible: in one pocket, out the other. The U.S. taxpayers do not want their money going to organizations which do this.

Let us vote against this amendment and urge my colleagues to support the present language.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a leader on international family planning.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and many others for their leadership on this issue.

First and foremost, family planning helps prevent abortion. No U.S. dollars are used for abortions around the world. This amendment is about saving women's lives. It is about women dying to the tune of over 600,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, while we are debating this motion to strike, over 65 women will die around the world from pregnancy-related causes. This safe delivery kit costs \$1.25; yet it can mean the difference between life and death. Its contents are simple, a plastic sheet, a bar of soap, some gauze, a razor; yet in rural areas and emergency situations, this saves women's lives.

The language we are striking restricts the use of a foreign NGOs own funds. In America, this language is unconstitutional. Around the world, it is unconscionable.

The gag rule is enough to make us gag. It cripples foreign NGOs ability to practice democracy in their own countries. The United States has always been very proud of exporting what is best about our country, our ideals, democracy; but this bill exports one of the worst, if not the worst of our country, our own internal politics.

We cannot afford to stifle the international debate on family planning by tying the hands of NGOs with this antiwoman gag rule. It forces NGOs to choose between their own democratic rights, to organize and to determine what is best in their own countries and desperately needed resources of U.S. family-planning dollars.

This is not a choice we should be forcing on the women of the world, and many of the poorest countries that are often struggling democracies. I urge a yes vote on this important motion to strike.

First and foremost, this is not about abortion.

It's about women dying, to the tune of 600,000 a year.

And it's about saving women lives. No U.S. federal funds have been used or around the world for abortions.

During the time we are debating this amendment, 65 women will die from pregnancy related complications.

This kit, a safe delivery kit, is used around the world where women lack access to adequate health care facilities. Its contents are simple—a sterile sheet of plastic, on which the baby is delivered, a bar of soap, a sterile surgical blade, two rolls of umbilical tape, and cotton gauze bandages.